



**California
Building
Industry
Association**

1215 K Street
Suite 1200
Sacramento, CA 95814
916/443-7933
fax 916/443-1960
www.cbia.org

2004 OFFICERS

President
SHERMAN D. HARMER
Urban Housing Partners
San Diego

Treasurer/Secretary
STEPHEN P. DOYLE
Brookfield Homes
Del Mar

Chief Executive Officer
ROBERT RIVINIUS, CAE
Sacramento

**MEMBER
ASSOCIATIONS**

Building Industry
Association of
Central California
Modesto

Building Industry
Association of
the Delta
Stockton

Building Industry
Association of
Kern County
Bakersfield

Home Builders
Association of
Central Coast
San Luis Obispo

Home Builders
Association of
Northern California
San Ramon

Home Builders
Association of
Redwood Coast
Eureka

Building Industry
Association of
San Diego County
San Diego

Building Industry
Association of
San Joaquin Valley
Fresno

Building Industry
Association of
Southern California
Diamond Bar

Building Industry
Association of
Superior California
Sacramento

Building Industry
Association of
Tulare/Kings Counties
Visalia

August 24, 2004

Dorothy Shimer
Research Division, 5th Floor
Air Resources Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA. 95812

Subject: Indoor Air Pollution in California, Draft for Public Review, June 2004

Dear Ms. Shimmer:

The California Building Industry Association (CBIA) is a statewide trade association representing over 6,200 member-companies involved in residential and light commercial construction. The following comments are submitted in response to our review of ARB's Draft Report entitled "Indoor Air Pollution in California" as prompted by the 2002 legislation, AB 1173 (Keeley).

Mitigation Option Feasibility Analysis:

In the spring and summer of 2002, CBIA, the California Chamber of Commerce and a host of other interested parties from the business community provided substantial input on AB 1173 (Keeley) as it worked its way through the Legislature. Industry strongly supported the amendment to the bill that established Health and Safety Code Section 39930(b)(3) which requires: *"An analysis of the indoor emissions, indoor exposures, and potential health effects from the indoor source categories described in paragraph (1), and options for mitigating those health effects in schools, non-industrial workplaces, homes, and other indoor locations, including, but not limited to, a discussion of the feasibility and public health effects of implementing each option."*

The current Draft Report fails to respond to the letter and spirit of the provision of AB 1173 cited above. Industry recognizes the challenge that is presented in providing a thorough and complete feasibility discussion for each mitigation option, but we also recognize the importance that accurate feasibility information will play in the decision making process that will most certainly follow the release of the final report.

Without this information, the housing industry, the greater business community, facility managers, and individuals and especially government will not be able to weigh and implement the recommendations of the Report to the Legislature in a reasonable and balanced manner. Before the Draft Report advances to the Scientific Review Panel and the ARB Governing Board, we strongly urge that a feasibility discussion be thoroughly addressed and accompany each mitigation option and recommended strategy.

Discussion of feasibility should clearly include the cost, availability of resources, availability of alternative processes/products (as compared to the existing products), and time needed to implement process and/or design changes, and finally, a comparison of this cost and effort to the level of health risk improvement to be expected. We also recommend that the Scientific Review panel and interested members of the public be afforded the ability to examine the methods and assumptions used to construct the feasibility evaluation and the assumed health benefits associated with the recommendations.

Reference to ASHRAE Standard 62.2:

The report cites American society of Heating and Refrigeration Engineers (ASHRAE) Standard 62.2 as the latest guidance on indoor air quality in residential buildings. The report states that this ASHRAE standard could be the basis for future state standards.

This standard was (and has been) the focus of much controversy and opposition at the national level. The attached documents provided by the staff of the National Association of Home Builders clearly identify a number of concerns with the development of this standard which were provided to ASHRAE, yet never addressed. Mechanical ventilation of bathroom facilities is a good example of an air-flow requirement that can't be met in a reasonable matter (at worst) or is simply a design specification mistake in the final document (at best).

While ASHRAE is known for its longstanding expertise in developing and maintaining a multitude of engineering standards on numerous subject matters, a great deal of national controversy is associated with ASHRAE Standard 62.2 and it may be highly inappropriate to reference it, in its entirety, as a possible basis for future state standards.

Revise Presentation of Health Risks, Costs. The Draft Report states that annual costs of \$35 billion are caused by indoor air pollution of various kinds. However, 73% of this cost is due to environmental tobacco smoke alone. To place both health risk and cost in a more accurate perspective, we recommend that the cost summary provided in Table ES-2 be restructured to separate out costs due to environmental tobacco smoke from other sources. Further, we recommend that the new cost table for environmental tobacco smoke be titled in a manner that conveys the tentative nature of the cost estimates, due to outdated nationwide data that is not fully reflective of California smoking patterns.

Also, the Draft Report does not discuss the net costs of indoor air quality taking into consideration both health effects and mitigation costs. At present, it is not clear if a proportionality exists between the health effect and the proposed mitigations, in terms of both cost and reduced exposure.

Revisit Priorities. The Draft Report identifies that up to 73% of the health effects of indoor air pollutants are due to environmental tobacco smoke. Nevertheless, building materials and furnishings are singled out as the top priority for mitigation. Many types of emissions from building materials and furnishings have dropped since the 1980s due to voluntary industry action and guidance from state agencies and professional organizations. The Draft must fully explain the criteria used to evaluate the categories of

mitigation and revise the order of priority as appropriate based on level of exposure and health effects. We look forward to commenting further when we can better understand the rationale for this ranking.

Thank you for your consideration and incorporation of these comments and recommendations into the final Draft Report. CBIA stands ready to work with your staff to improve the Draft Report so that it fully responds to the Legislature's charge.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Bob Raymer". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a long, sweeping tail on the "m".

Robert E. Raymer, PE
Technical Director